

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Alfress COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS PO Eq. (140) Alexandra, Viguna 11313-1450 www.upro.gev

APPLICATION NO	FII ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/674,771	12 29 2000	Rudolf Heinz	R.34720	3714
75	90 05 15 2003			
Ronald E Greigg Greigg & Greigg 1423 Powhatan Street Unit One			EXAMINER	
			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
Alexandria, VA 22314			ARI UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2834 DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/674,771	HEINZ ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark Budd	2834
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relification of the maximum statutory perions a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) Status	I. 1 136(a) In no event, however, may a copy within the statutory minimum of this dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOP tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	1 March 2003 .	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ 1	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>49,50,53,61,62 and 65</u> is/are pend	ing in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>49,50,53,61,62 and 65</u> is/are rejected	ed.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in i		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	-xaminer.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
Certified copies of the priority document		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International E* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language p 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes 		
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 49, 50, 53, 61, 62 and 65 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Hatschek. Angeloff or Maruyama for the specific reasons set forth in the previous office action. Applicants have argued that the electrode connections of the references do not extent in the circumferential direction at least a substantial extent" and thus do not anticipate the claimed structure. Hatschek (fig. 2). Maruyama (figs. 1 and 10) and Angeloff (fig. 7) each show the leads extending along the circumferential surface of the piezo stack. "A substantial extent" is not seen as any quantifiable physical structure that could be differentiated from the prior art structures. No specific dimensions or limits (e.g. 35 percent of the circumference) are specified; thus no measurable limits different from the prior art are cited. "Substantial" is in the eye of the beholder. Obviously Angeloff, Hatschek and Maruyama provided lead widths they considered "substantial" enough for the job. The Random those College Dictionary (Revised Edition) defines substantial as "of ample amount", quantity or size" or of solid quality". Thus, "a substantial amount" is not seen as a patentable distinction.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

Art Unit: 2834

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Budd'ds

05/13/02